

REMARKS

By the above amendment, Applicants have: 1) amended claims 19-21 and 23-27; 2) added claims 28-39; and 3) canceled claim 22 without prejudice. As such, claims 19-21 and 23-39 are now pending. Support for the amendment is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendment does not add new matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and consideration of the following remarks and the claims.

Double Patenting

“Claims 19, 22-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being respectively unpatentable over claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,785 B1.”

A terminal disclaimer is filed along with this amendment without Applicants agreeing with the non-statutory double patent rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

“Claims 20-21, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.”

The Office Action rejected claims 20-21 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In particular, claims 20-21 and 27 are rejected because they depend on non-existing claims. Applicants have amended claims 20-21 and 27 to correct these errors. The amended claims 20-21 now depend on claim 19, and claim 27, as amended, now depends on claim 26. As for claim 26, this claim has been amended, partly, to make the meanings of various limitations more clear.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

“Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.”

The Office Action rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §101 stating that the claim is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants amended claim 26, partly, to make clear that the claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

“Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rangan et al., “Design an On-Demand Multimedia Service”, IEEE, Pages: 56-64, 7/1992.”

The Office Action rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Rangan et al. Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, the Office Action stated that Table 1 of Rangan shows

each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. Table 1 of Rangan is used simply to summarize various symbols used in the article.

Claim 26 now recites:

26. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium having stored thereon executable computer program instructions, the executable computer program instructions including an action class list and, when executed by a digital processing system, causing the system to perform a method for playback of actions from the action class list, wherein:
the action class list comprising comprises a plurality of action class description fields, each action class description field having a first field containing data which specifies a particular action class and a second field containing data which specifies a generic explanation of the action specified in the corresponding first field,
whereby the action class list ~~arranged to be~~ is used during playback of an action to determine an explanation associated with the action class of the action and to accompany the played back action with the determined explanation.

The Office Action stated that “*Rangan discloses the claim limitation by showing a data structure (Table 1, p.58) ...*”. Applicants respectfully disagree. Rangan does not show each and every element of the claim limitation of claim 26. In particular, Rangan is completely silent on “the action class list” which may be used during playback of an action to determine an explanation associated with the action class of the action” as well as “to accompany the played back action with the determined explanation”. Furthermore,

Rangan is completely silent on “executable computer program instructions” which, “when executed by a digital processing system”, causes “the system to perform a method for playback of actions from the action class list”.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is patentable over the prior art, and they request reconsideration of the present application and all pending claims including new claims.


CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore they submit that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action they respectfully solicit. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Jimmi Yoon at (408) 720-8300, extension 305.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due or credit any overages. If an extension is required, Applicants hereby request such extension.

Respectfully Submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 3/3, 2006



Hyungsoo "Jimmi" Yoon
Reg. No.: 57,637

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300